

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter that Applicant regards as the invention.

Reconsideration of the subject patent application in view of the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 is amended.

Claim 20 is canceled.

Claims 1-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,542,106 to Krenz et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,554,996 to Chatzipetros. For the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 20 has been cancelled. Thus, the rejection as it applies to claim 20 is moot.

Regarding claim 1, Krenz in view of Chatzipetros does not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious “the first antenna element, the connection portion and the conductor element form a dipole antenna,” as required. Krenz does not disclose the conductor element (a second antenna) as admitted by the Examiner in the current Office Action, page 5, lines 12-13. The Office Action states that Chatzipetros discloses a second antenna. However, Chatzipetros does not disclose that the connection portion, through which one end of the feeding portion is electrically connected to the first antenna element, together with the first antenna element and the conductor element, forms a dipole antenna. There is no disclosure in Chatzipetros that a hinge 106 (which corresponds to the connection portion of the present invention), a first antenna 108 and a second antenna 110

(which corresponds to the conductor element of the present invention) form a dipole antenna. Chatzipetros merely discloses that a hinge 106 couples a flap 104 to a housing 102 (Chatzipetros; column 2, lines 5-6). Accordingly, the combination of Krenz and Chatzipetros does not meet all of the limitations of claim 1. Therefore, the asserted combination of Krenz and Chatzipetros does not render claim 1 obvious. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-19 and 21-22 which are dependent from claim 1 should also be allowable for at least the same reason.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. NGB-37395.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: 

Nobuhiko Sukenaga, Reg. No. 39446

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

DATE May 19, 2008